UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK ECTRONICALLY FILED

DATE FILED: 12/28/19

USDC SDNY

JULIA ZABOLOTSKY,

Plaintiff,

-against-

EOUIFAX; EXPERIAN; TRANSUNION; MACY'S,

Defendants.

19-CV-11832 (GHW) ORDER OF SERVICE

GREGORY H. WOODS, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, appearing pro se, brings this action alleging that Defendants violated her rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), 15 U.S.C. § 1681. By order dated December 27, 2019, the Court granted Plaintiff's request to proceed without prepayment of fees, that is, in forma pauperis (IFP).

DISCUSSION

Service on Defendants A.

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, Plaintiff is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service. Walker v. Schult, 717 F.3d. 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) ("The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases."); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP)). Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that the summons and complaint be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served the summonses and complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that summonses be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date the summonses are issued. If the complaint is not served within that time, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service.

See Meilleur v. Strong, 682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff's responsibility to request an extension of time for service); see also Murray v. Pataki, 378 F. App'x 50, 52 (2d Cir. 2010) ("As long as the [plaintiff proceeding IFP] provides the information necessary to identify the defendant, the Marshals' failure to effect service automatically constitutes 'good cause' for an extension of time within the meaning of Rule 4(m).").

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendants Equifax, Experian, TransUnion, and Macy's through the U.S. Marshals Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return form ("USM-285 form") for each of these Defendants. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue summonses and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals Service to effect service upon these Defendants.

Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if Plaintiff's address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

CONCLUSION

The Clerk of Court is directed to transmit this order to Plaintiff, together with an information package.¹

The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issues summonses, complete the USM-285 forms with the addresses for Equifax, Experian, TransUnion, and Macy's and deliver all documents necessary to effect service to the U.S. Marshals Service.

¹ Plaintiff has consented to receive electronic service of notices and documents in this case. (ECF No. 3.)

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *Cf. Coppedge*

v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that an appellant demonstrates good faith when

he seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 28, 2019

New York, New York

GREGORY H. WOODS

United States District Judge

DEFENDANTS AND SERVICE ADDRESSES

1. Equifax

The Prentice Hall Corporation System, Inc. 80 State Street Albany, New York 12207

2. Experian

CT Corporation System 28 Liberty Street New York, New York 10005

3. TransUnion

The Prentice Hall Corporation System, Inc. 251 Little Falls Drive Wilmington, DE 19808

4. Macy's

Corporate Office 7 West 7th Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202